

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/574,719	Applicant(s) LACROIX, ROGER	
	Examiner NATHAN LEONG	Art Unit 1792	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NATHAN LEONG. (3)_____.

(2) Robert Holthus. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 25 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 2 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner contacted attorney Robert Holthus for clarification regarding claims 2 and 10. Attorney confirmed that claims 2 and 10 are markush group claims, where each of the listed dyes is a species, which could each be used as the anionic dye of claim 1, and that claims 2 and 10 are not claiming to use the listed compounds as a mixture.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/NATHAN LEONG/
Examiner, Art Unit 1792